

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 99-1840

MANU KAPOOR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

J. MAJORS; FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER AND
JACOBSON,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 99-1881

MANU KAPOOR,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER AND JACOBSON;
JAY MAJORS; THOMAS P. VARTANIAN,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema, District
Judge. (CA-99-856-A, CA-99-778-A)

Submitted: May 11, 2000

Decided: May 16, 2000

Before MURNAGHAN, LUTTIG, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Manu Kapoor, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

In these consolidated appeals, Manu Kapoor appeals the district court's orders dismissing her civil legal malpractice actions for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, although we grant Kapoor's motion to proceed in forma pauperis in No. 99-1881, we deny Kapoor's motions for appointment of counsel and affirm both decisions on the reasoning of the district court. See Kapoor v. Majors, No. CA-99-856-A (E.D. Va. June 16, 1999); Kapoor v. Fried, Frank, Harris, Shriver & Jacobson, No. CA-99-778-A (E.D. Va. June 2, 1999).^{*} We deny all of Kapoor's requests for an emergency hearing and for oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

^{*} Although the district court's orders are signed and date stamped on June 15, 1999, and June 1, 1999, the district court's records show that they were entered on the docket sheet on June 16 and June 2, respectively. Pursuant to Rules 58 and 79(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, it is the date that the order was entered on the docket sheet that we take as the effective date of the district court's decision. See Wilson v. Murray, 806 F.2d 1232, 1234-35 (4th Cir. 1986).